

CONSULTANT SELECTION COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description

Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center

Project Number

2022-057

Name of Selection Panel Chair

Indra Jain

		THIS OCCIONICC	L DCCCITICS I	ublic Neccol	u					
Pha	se 1 - SOQ		Date:	9/24/2021	_			Number of Subm	nitting Firms:	4
		Firms	Indra Jain Rank Order	Tony Ifie Rank Order	Chris Szarek Rank Order	Mushka Rohani Rank Order	Ko Sugeng Wibowo Rank Order	DIVERSE BUSINESS EQUITY & INCLUSION STRATEGIES	TOTAL PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
1	Schreiber	Starling Whitehead	3	1	2	3	2	Yes	11	2
2	McGranah	an Architects	2	2	4	1	3	Yes	12	3
3	Miller Hull	Partnership	1	3	1	2	1	Yes	8	1
4	Integrus A	rchitecture	4	4	3	4	4	Yes	19	4
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
Pha	se 2 Intervie	eW.	Date:	10/7/2021	1	Number of Firms	Interviewed:	3		
				RANK ORDEI	R OF COMMITTE	E MEMBERS]		1
							Ko Sugona	DIVERSE	TOTAL	FINAL

			RANK ORDE	R OF COMMITTE	E MEMBERS				
	Firms	Indra Jain	Tony Ifie	Chris Szarek	Mushka Rohani	Ko Sugeng Wibowo	DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
		Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order			
1	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	3	1	3	2	3	X	12	3
2	Miller Hull Partnership	2	3	2	3	1	Х	11	2
3	McGranahan Architects	1	2	1	1	2	Х	7	1
4									
5									

Andra Jain

ndra Jain

Chris Szarek

Ko Sugeng Wibowo

Anthony Ifie

Tony Ifie

Mushka Rohani (Oct 11, 2021 09:05 PDT

Mushka Rohani



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description Edmonds Community Co	llege - Triton Learning
Cente	er
Consensus Date	Project Number
9/24/2021	2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member	

Indra Jain

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Diverse Business Equity & Inclusion Strategies	Qualific Key Pe	ations of rsonnel		vant		cle Cost lysis rience	Susta Des Expei	ign	Past Per	formance		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Yes/ No	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	SCORE	ORDER
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	Yes	92.0	27.6	91.0	22.8	95.0	9.5	95.0	9.5	93.0	23.3		92.6	3
2 McGranahan Architects	Yes	94.0	28.2	94.0	23.5	97.0	9.7	97.0	9.7	96.0	24.0		95.1	2
3 Miller Hull Partnership	Yes	96.0	28.8	95.0	23.8	96.0	9.6	99.0	9.9	97.0	24.3		96.3	1
4 Integrus Architecture	Yes	87.0	26.1	84.0	21.0	93.0	9.3	94.0	9.4	89.0	22.3		88.1	4
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														
COMMENTS:													- 	

Andra Jain Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Edmonds Community Coll	ege - Triton Learning Center
Consensus Date	Project Number
9/24/2021	2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member	-
Ton	ıv Ifie

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		Past Performance				TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score		SCORE	
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		90.0	27.0	90.0	22.5	90.0	9.0	95.0	9.5	90.0	22.5			90.5	1
2 McGranahan Architects		90.0	27.0	90.0	22.5	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	22.5			90.0	2
3 Miller Hull Partnership		85.0	25.5	85.0	21.3	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	85.0	21.3			86.0	3
4 Integrus Architecture		80.0	24.0	80.0	20.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	80.0	20.0			82.0	4
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20															

Anthony Ifie 9/24/2021

Tony Ifie Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning Center

Consensus Date

9/24/2021

Name of Selection Panel Member

Chris Szarek

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		Qualification Perso		Relevant E	Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		ormance			TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
S	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score		SCORE	
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		80.0	24.0	83.0	20.8	83.0	8.3	100.0	10.0	100.0	25.0			88.1	2
2 McGranahan Architects		87.0	26.1	91.0	22.8	83.0	8.3	66.0	6.6	75.0	18.8			82.5	4
3 Miller Hull Partnership		100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	100.0	10.0	83.0	8.3	87.0	21.8			95.1	1
4 Integrus Architecture		75.0	22.5	91.0	22.8	83.0	8.3	66.0	6.6	100.0	25.0			85.2	3
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20															
COMMENTS:	u u	•		•						•				•	

Chris Szarek

9/24/2021

Chris Szarek



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Mushka Rohani

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		ormance			TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
Sco	res Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score		SCORE	
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	82.0	24.6	89.0	22.3	85.0	8.5	90.0	9.0	85.0	21.3			85.6	3
2 McGranahan Architects	92.0	27.6	95.0	23.8	92.0	9.2	95.0	9.5	92.0	23.0			93.1	1
3 Miller Hull Partnership	90.0	27.0	93.0	23.3	90.0	9.0	92.0	9.2	90.0	22.5			91.0	2
4 Integrus Architecture	80.0	24.0	82.0	20.5	80.0	8.0	83.0	8.3	83.0	20.8			81.6	4
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														
COMMENTS:					<u> </u>				1					

Mushka Rohani Mushka Rohani (Oct 11, 2021 09:05 PDT)

9/24/2021

ishka Rohani Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Edmonds Community Coll	lege - Triton Learning Center
Consensus Date	Project Number
9/24/2021	2022-057
Name of Selection Panel Member	
Ko Suge	ng Wibowo

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		Qualifications of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		Past Performance				TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score		000.1.2	
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		98.0	29.4	95.0	23.8	98.0	9.8	95.0	9.5	97.0	24.3			96.7	2
2 McGranahan Architects		95.0	28.5	98.0	24.5	95.0	9.5	95.0	9.5	92.0	23.0			95.0	3
3 Miller Hull Partnership		98.0	29.4	98.0	24.5	95.0	9.5	98.0	9.8	95.0	23.8			97.0	1
4 Integrus Architecture		93.0	27.9	95.0	23.8	92.0	9.2	90.0	9.0	92.0	23.0			92.9	4
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20															

| 9/24/2021 | Ko Sugeng Wibowo | Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

		Schreiber Starling			r Hull	McGra	nahan				
CRITERIA	Weighting	White	head	Partne	ership	Archi	tects		1		
		Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighter Score
ORGANIZATION	30%	92.0	27.6	98.0	29.4	99.0	29.7				
95											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevant team members pre	sent and wha	at role are th	ey assumin	g in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Production Capabilities: Does the firm explain their work	load for the o	luration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	roject fits in	nto the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	95.0	19.0	98.0	19.6	99.0	19.8				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the for project scope in the past.		•				. ,			,	managed de	
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e								jects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule need	ds and then	meet client s	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	96.0	14.4	97.0	14.6	98.0	14.7				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that understand the project and the project requirements	they have rev	viewed avail	able project	information,	attended in	formational	meeting, or	done indepe	ndent resea	arch to better	r
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	hallenges an	d/or opportu	ınities they s	ee for the p	roject?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	94.0	18.8	98.0	19.6	98.0	19.6				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fir	m has done	and how th	at relates or	provides gu	uidance for th	nis project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te	am members	have expe	rience that re	elates to the	project type	e or complex	ity?	1		1	1
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	94.0	7.5	97.0	7.8	98.0	7.8				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise i	n decision n	naking? Are	they familia	r with the Ol	FM requiren	nents? Are t	hey differer	tiating betwe	een LCCA
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	94.0	6.6	98.0	6.9	98.0	6.9				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this project	ct. How can	the sustain	ability strate	gies mesh v	vith the proje	ct budget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored)	X)	<)	<				
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	565.0		586.0		590.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			93.9		97.8		98.5				
			3		2		1				
FINAL RANK ORDER					-						

Andra Jain
Indra Jain

Oct 8, 2021

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description		
Edmonds Community Col	lege - Triton Learning Ce	nter
Date of Evaluation	Project Number	
10/7/2021	2022-057	
Name of Selection Panel Member		
To	ny Ifie	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

		,										
				r Starling	-	r Hull	McGra					
C	CRITERIA	Weighting	White	head	Partn	ership	Arch	itects			_	
			Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighte Score
ORGANIZATION		30%	90.0	27.0	87.0	26.1	88.0	26.4				
95			·									
Team Member Qualifications:	Are the relevant team members prese	ent and what	role are the	y assuming	in the discus	sion						
Capacity/Production Capabilit	ies: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the du	ration of the	project and	how this pro	ject fits into	the firm's ov	erall plannin	g			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT		20%	90.0	18.0	91.0	18.2	90.0	18.0				
Scope Management: Based of project scope in the past.	on the information provided and the Fi	nalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team ascert	ained basic	project requ	irements an	d how well h	ave they ma	anaged deve	lopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: W	hat strategies does the firm use to est	ablish and m	ıanage proje	ct budgets.	How succes	ssful have th	ey been with	n past projec	ts			
Project Scheduling: How doe	s this finalist team develop schedules.	How well de	o they listen	to client sch	edule needs	and then m	neet client sc	hedule need	ls.			
PROJECT APPROACH		15%	90.0	13.5	88.0	13.2	91.0	13.7				
the project and the project rec	· 						rmational mo	eeting, or do	ne independ	lent researc	h to better ur	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: F	las the Finalist attempted to define ch	allenges and	l/or opportur	ities they se	e for the pro	ject?		1	1	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		
EXPERIENCE		20%	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0				
Relevant Past Projects (firm):	Does the Finalist team discuss past v	vork the firm	has done a	nd how that	relates or pr	ovides guida	ance for this	project?				
	2000 and I mailer toam alooado paor											
Relevant Past Projects (key to	eam members): Do the individual tear	n members I	have experie	ence that rela	ates to the p	roject type o	r complexity	?	1	-	1	
Relevant Past Projects (key to LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS	eam members): Do the individual tear	m members I 8%	90.0	ence that relative	90.0	roject type o	87.0	7.0				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS	eam members): Do the individual tear	8%	90.0	7.2	90.0	7.2	87.0	7.0	nts? Are the	y differentia	ting between	LCCA a
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS Does the Finalist team unders ELCCA?	eam members): Do the individual tear IS EXPERIENCE stand the value in a comprehensive Lif	8%	90.0	7.2	90.0	7.2	87.0	7.0	nts? Are the	y differentia	ting between	LCCA a
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS Does the Finalist team unders ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXF	eam members): Do the individual tear IS EXPERIENCE stand the value in a comprehensive Lif	8% Te Cycle Cos 7%	90.0 t exercise in 85.0	7.2 decision ma	90.0 aking? Are ti	7.2 hey familiar	87.0 with the OFM	7.0 1 requirement	nts? Are the	y differentia	ting between	LCCA a
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS Does the Finalist team unders ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXF	eam members): Do the individual tear IS EXPERIENCE stand the value in a comprehensive Life PERIENCE	8% Te Cycle Cos 7%	90.0 t exercise in 85.0	7.2 decision ma	90.0 aking? Are ti	7.2 hey familiar	87.0 with the OFM	7.0 1 requirement	nts? Are the	y differentia	ting between	LCCA a
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS Does the Finalist team unders ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXF What strategies have the Final	eam members): Do the individual tear IS EXPERIENCE stand the value in a comprehensive Life PERIENCE	8% Te Cycle Cos 7% Tr this project	90.0 t exercise in 85.0 . How can t	7.2 decision ma	90.0 aking? Are to 87.0 bility strategic	7.2 hey familiar	87.0 with the OFM 87.0 n the project	7.0 1 requirement	nts? Are the	y differentia	ing between	LCCA a
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS Does the Finalist team unders ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXF What strategies have the Fina TOTAL Raw SCORE	eam members): Do the individual tear IS EXPERIENCE stand the value in a comprehensive Life PERIENCE	8% Te Cycle Cos 7% Tr this project	90.0 t exercise in 85.0 . How can t	7.2 decision ma 6.0 he sustainal	90.0 aking? Are to 87.0 bility strategic	7.2 hey familiar 6.1 es mesh with	87.0 with the OFM 87.0 n the project	7.0 1 requirement 6.1 budget.	nts? Are the	y differentia	ing between	LCCA a

Anthony Ifie	Oct 11, 2021
Tony Ifie	Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description								
Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning								
Center								
Date of Evaluation	Project Number							
10/7/2021	2022-057							
Name of Selection Panel Member								
Chris Sza	rek							

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CDITEDIA	Mainhtin n	White	r Starling head	_	r Hull ership	McGra Archi					
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	30%	85.0	25.5	90.0	27.0	90.0	27.0				
95											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevant team members pre	sent and wh	at role are th	ey assumin	g in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Production Capabilities: Does the firm explain their work	load for the	duration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	oroject fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	85.0	17.0	90.0	18.0	95.0	19.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the F of project scope in the past.	inalist's exp							and how we	ll have they	managed de	velopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	ject budgets	s. How succ	essful have	they been w	ith past pro	jects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client :	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	100.0	15.0	85.0	12.8	85.0	12.8				
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that understand the project and the project requirements	they have re	viewed avail	able project	information	, attended in	formational	meeting, or	done indepe	endent resea	arch to better	Ī
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges an	ıd/or opportu	ınities they s	see for the p	roject?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fir	m has done	and how tha	at relates or	provides gu	idance for th	is project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	am members	s have exper	rience that re	elates to the	project type	or complex	ity?	1		1	
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	85.0	6.8	85.0	6.8	90.0	7.2				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise i	n decision m	naking? Are	they familia	r with the Ol	FM requiren	nents? Are	they differer	tiating betwe	en LCCA
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	90.0	6.3	90.0	6.3	95.0	6.7				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	or this proje	ct. How can	the sustain	ability strate	gies mesh v	vith the proje	ect budget.				-
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	535.0		530.0		545.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			88.6		88.9		90.6				
FINAL RANK ORDER			3		2		1				
COMMENTS:											

Chris Szarek
Chris Szarek

Oct 8, 2021

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description								
Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning								
Center								
Date of Evaluation	Project Number							
10/7/2021	2022-05	7						
Name of Selection Panel Member								

Mushka Rohani

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

	Schreiber Starlin			Miller Hull		McGra	nahan				
CRITERIA	Weighting	White	head		ership	Archi	tects				
ONTENIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	30%	90.0	27.0	86.0	25.8	92.0	27.6				
95											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevant team members pre	sent and wh	at role are th	ney assumin	g in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Production Capabilities: Does the firm explain their work	load for the	duration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	oroject fits ir	nto the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	91.0	18.2	89.0	17.8	93.0	18.6				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the F of project scope in the past.	inalist's exp	erience, how	well has th	e team asce	rtained bas	sic project re	quirements	and how we	ll have they	managed de	evelopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	ject budgets	s. How succ	essful have	they been w	ith past pro	jects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	89.0	13.4	88.0	13.2	92.0	13.8				
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that understand the project and the project requirements	they have re	viewed avail	able project	information	, attended ir	nformational	meeting, or	done indepe	endent resea	arch to bette	r
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges an	nd/or opportu	ınities they s	see for the p	roject?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	88.0	17.6	91.0	18.2	93.0	18.6				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fir	m has done	and how that	at relates or	provides gu	idance for th	is project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	am members	s have expe	rience that r	elates to the	project type	e or complex	ity?		1	,	1
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	87.0	7.0	88.0	7.0	89.0	7.1				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise i	n decision n	naking? Are	they familia	ar with the O	FM requiren	nents? Are	they differer	tiating betwe	een LCCA
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	7%	90.0	6.3	90.0	6.3	92.0	6.4				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	or this proje	ct. How car	the sustain	ability strate	gies mesh v	with the proje	ect budget.				
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	535.0		532.0		551.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			89.4		88.3		92.2				
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		3		1				
COMMENTS:											

Mushka Rohani (Oct 11, 2021 09:05 PDT)
Mushka Rohani

Oct 11, 2021

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description								
Edmonds Community College - Triton Learning								
Center								
Date of Evaluation	Project Number							
10/7/2021	2022-05	7						
Name of Selection Panel Member								

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

	This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record						Ko Sugeng Wibowo						
	CRITERIA		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		Miller Hull Partnership		McGranahan Architects						
	CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	
ORGANIZATION		30%	96.0	28.8	96.0	28.8	95.0	28.5					
95													
Team Member Qualification	s: Are the relevant team members pre	sent and wh	at role are th	ney assumin	g in the disc	ussion							
Capacity/Production Capabi	ilities: Does the firm explain their work	load for the	duration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	oroject fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ıning				
PROJECT MANAGEMENT		20%	97.0	19.4	98.0	19.6	97.0	19.4					
of project scope in the past.	d on the information provided and the F What strategies does the firm use to e							· 		ll have they	managed de	velopmen	
Project Scheduling: How do	pes this finalist team develop schedules	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule need	ds and then	meet client :	schedule ne	eds.				
PROJECT APPROACH	<u> </u>	15%	96.0	14.4	98.0	14.7	97.0	14.6					
Understanding of this project understand the project and	ct: Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project requirements	they have re	viewed avail	able project	information,	attended in	formational	meeting, or	done indepe	endent resea	arch to better		
Challenges & Opportunities:	: Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges ar	nd/or opportu	ınities they s	ee for the p	roject?							
EXPERIENCE		20%	93.0	18.6	92.0	18.4	95.0	19.0					
Relevant Past Projects (firm	n): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fir	m has done	and how that	at relates or	provides gu	idance for th	nis project?					
Relevant Past Projects (key	team members): Do the individual tea	am members		rience that re		project type	e or complex	rity?	ı		1		
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALY	YSIS EXPERIENCE	8%	92.0	7.4	96.0	7.7	94.0	7.5				<u> </u>	
Does the Finalist team under and ELCCA?	erstand the value in a comprehensive L	ife Cycle Co	st exercise i	n decision m	naking? Are	they familia	r with the O	FM requiren	nents? Are	they differer	itiating betwe	en LCCA	
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN E	XPERIENCE	7%	92.0	6.4	98.0	6.9	96.0	6.7					
What strategies have the Fi	nalists indicated might be appropriate t	or this proje	ct. How car	the sustain	ability strate	gies mesh v	vith the proje	ect budget.					
TOTAL Raw SCORE		100%	566.0		578.0		574.0						
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCOR	E			95.0		96.0		95.7					
FINAL RANK ORDER				3		1		2					
COMMENTS:													

Oct 8, 2021 Ko Sugeng Wibowo

22-057-ScoresheetSummary

Final Audit Report 2021-10-11

Created: 2021-10-08

By: Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)

Status: Signed

Transaction ID: CBJCHBCAABAAXETsX2CPqpbuKA78VHzdxbRFVxFind0x

"22-057-ScoresheetSummary" History

- Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov) 2021-10-08 9:25:18 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document emailed to Indra Jain (indra.jain@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-10-08 9:27:44 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Tony Ifie (tony.ifie@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-10-08 9:27:45 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu) for signature 2021-10-08 9:27:45 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Chris Szarek (chris.szarek@email.edcc.edu) for signature 2021-10-08 9:27:45 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Ko Wibowo (ko@architectureforeveryone.org) for signature 2021-10-08 9:27:46 PM GMT
- Email viewed by Ko Wibowo (ko@architectureforeveryone.org)
 2021-10-08 9:30:53 PM GMT- IP address: 172.226.3.196
- Document e-signed by Ko Wibowo (ko@architectureforeveryone.org)

 Signature Date: 2021-10-08 9:45:23 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 73.157.94.239
- Email viewed by Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu) 2021-10-08 9:58:57 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.207
- Email viewed by Indra Jain (indra.jain@des.wa.gov) 2021-10-08 - 10:15:54 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document e-signed by Indra Jain (indra.jain@des.wa.gov)

 Signature Date: 2021-10-08 10:26:50 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30



- Email viewed by Chris Szarek (chris.szarek@email.edcc.edu)
 2021-10-08 10:57:06 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.201
- Document e-signed by Chris Szarek (chris.szarek@email.edcc.edu)

 Signature Date: 2021-10-08 10:57:56 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 168.156.251.64
- Email viewed by Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu) 2021-10-11 3:23:03 AM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.201
- Email viewed by Tony Ifie (tony.ifie@des.wa.gov) 2021-10-11 3:49:12 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254
- Document e-signed by Tony Ifie (tony.ifie@des.wa.gov)

 Signature Date: 2021-10-11 3:50:26 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document e-signed by Mushka Rohani (mushka.rohani@email.edcc.edu)

 Signature Date: 2021-10-11 4:05:09 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 71.231.157.179
- Agreement completed.